UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,674	11/13/2003	Frederick Wilkins	I0168-7075.19	9082
	7590 09/09/200 IDO & ANASTASI, L	EXAMINER		
ONE MAIN ST	REET, SUITE 1100	PHASGE, ARUN S		
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@ll-a.com gengelson@ll-a.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/712,674	WILKINS ET AL.	WILKINS ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Arun S. Phasge	1795				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 136(a). In no event, however, may a repl will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH te, cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. y be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this c IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 S	Sentember 2007					
•		s action is non-final.					
3)	, 						
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
· · _	Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application	า					
-							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5)∭ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.						
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to: Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement					
		or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document according to the priority document according to the certified copies of the priority document according to t	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apportity documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National	Stage			
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infori	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 11/28/07, 5/19/08.	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application				



Application No.

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ep Patent 1,172,145 in view of Briggs and Bianchi of record for reasons of record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not have turned to the teachings of the Bianchi to modify the teachings of Briggs or Sato. This appears to be an argument alleging non-analogous art.

Section 103 requires us to presume full knowledge by the inventor of the prior art in the field of his endeavor (emphasis, expect of "prior," added), but it does not require us to presume full knowledge by the inventor of prior art outside the field of his endeavor, i.e. of "non-analogous" art. In that respect, it only requires us to presume that the inventor would have that ability to select and utilize knowledge from other arts reasonably pertinent to his particular problem which would be expected of a man of ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. *In re Antle*, 170 U.S.P.Q. 285.

The Bianchi patent is cited to teach the deoxygenation to reduce the corrosion potential of the deionized water. The water passing the cathode is deoxygenated and thereby the corrosion potential is reduced (see claims 1-7). Accordingly, the reference is

analogous art, because it does the same thing recited in the claims, i.e., the feeding of a deionized water through a cathode chamber to reduce the corrosion potential.

Applicants further states that Briggs and Bianchi would not be combinable, because the techniques of Bianchi would be rendered inoperable by the teachings of Briggs. the Briggs patent teaches that at the cathode water is electrolyzed to raise the pH by hydroxyl ions (see col. 4). Bianchi discloses the electrolytic formation of hydrogen ions from water which would have the corresponding formation of hydroxyl ions. It is unclear how these two references disclosing the electrolytic treatment of water at the electrodes can render one technique inoperable.

Accordingly, the claims stand rejected.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is (571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Arun S. Phasge/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795